

MINUTES OF THE MEETING  
FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE  
MONTANA STATE  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

January 24, 1985

The meeting of the Fish and Game Committee was called to order by Chairman Bob Ream on January 24, 1985, at 3:14 p.m. in room 312-1 of the State Capitol.

ROLL CALL: All committee members were present.

CONSIDERATION OF HOUSE BILL NO. 191: Representative Tom Asay, District 47, Forsyth, sponsor of this bill, stated he would like to preface this bill to the committee. He said that in eastern Montana this year there was an extreme over population of deer. This bill was primarily a direct response to or a means of trying to get the situation aired so that they could show the extent of the damage done. The intent of this bill is not necessarily to receive compensation for damages; the real intent of this bill is to prevent that. They would rather harvest the crops than have them harvested for them. That was the general attitude that prevailed as they prepared this bill. In the title of this bill they have specified that they are going to provide a procedure for determining damage. He said that the Fish, Wildlife, and Parks is not a benevolent society and they do not intend to make donations or contributions or put out money. He feels that if the procedure is well enough laid out and properly handled, then they will not have a problem. Representative Asay then referred to the fiscal note and read the assumptions from this note to the committee. Representative Asay also passed out to the committee, a hand-out which stated damages and costs of lost alfalfa by deer. (See Exhibit No. 1)

PROPOSERS: Lee Howard, Hysham, Montana, spoke in support of House Bill No. 191, and covered some of the specific damages that occur. He said that they were willing to live with some of the damages the deer do; but this year they have had a tremendous amount of damage and a tremendous population explosion. They have also had a very depressed livestock economy and the deer are damaging the hay. He expressed that they anticipate damage up to a point, but what they are experiencing is extreme damage of hay crops and stacks. He also noted to the committee some of the suggestions he has received from the Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks concerning the deer damage and overpopulation. In conclusion, he stated that what he sees is a department that has either mismanaged

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

January 24, 1985

Page Two

the population, or actually attempted to expand the population.

Representative Ray Brandewie, District 49, Bigfork, a Montana Christmas Tree Association Director, stated that he brought some pictures to show to the committee. These pictures showed the Christmas trees that had been eaten and damaged by deer. He stated whether the committee approved of the bill or not, at some point in time the Fish and Game Commission response will have to be timely. He said that his trees were worth about \$2.00 per foot. He also said that he is not asking for zero damage, but what he would like to see is some help in decreasing the deer damage and population. He does not want to see deer decimated, but he has suffered \$30,000.00 worth of damage. He said that this is a serious problem in both eastern and western Montana, and they need help solving the problem.

Representative John Patterson, District 97, Custer, stated that in his district he has a lot of farmers who produce alfalfa crops and corn, and they have had a lot of damage because of the deer. Many of the farmers are having trouble paying their mortgages because of all the damage done to their crops, so the bankers want them to get rid of the deer. He also stated that because of the fire in the Bull Mountains this summer, many of the deer have moved down to the Yellowstone River area and are doing extensive damage to the crops there. He feels that this bill should be looked upon as a way to improve landowner and department relationships.

Charles May, Hysham, stated that he raises cattle and hay in the Sarpy Creek area, and in the last three or four years crop damage by deer has become increasingly worse. He said that the deer have moved in on them, and they clip the hay down so that it will not grow. He said he has cooperated with hunters, but he would like to see some other game management control also. He feels that they need some kind of program so that they can work with the Fish and Game.

Dave Hage, a Forsyth area rancher, stated that in 1983 he lost 130 acres of alfalfa seed to deer. In 1982 he

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE  
January 24, 1985  
Page Three

had harvested about \$15,000 worth of seed off this same land. This fall he said he brought in cutter bees which cost him twenty five percent of the crop and he still harvested less with the cutter bees than he did in 1982.

Curt Gambill, Forsyth, stated that they, too, were having problems with the deer eating all the alfalfa in their area. He also stated that this problem was having a big effect on the beef industry.

Lorna Frank, representing the Montana Farm Bureau, spoke in support of House Bill 191. (See Exhibit No. 2)

Stuart Doggett, representing the Montana Stockgrowers and the Montana Association of Grazing Districts, stated that this bill is a step in the right direction. There is tremendous damage being done to crops in many counties of our state.

Carol Mosher, representing the Montana Cowbellies, spoke in support of House Bill 191. (See Exhibit No. 3)

Bob Gilbert, representing the Montana Woolgrowers Association, stated that his association is concerned about how this bill would be funded, but that it is in support of House Bill 191.

Representative Loren Jenkins, District 13, a rancher from north central Montana, said that they have had some damage in their area to alfalfa crops by deer also. He feels that Representative Asay's bill has some provisions that will not cost the Department any money, unless they do not act on a complaint. He feels that they can give a rancher a kill permit or initiate a special hunting season. He noted that it would only cost the Department money, if they refuse to take notice of a persons complaint. He said that he thinks this bill would hopefully, help the Fish and Game and the ranchers to get along better.

Representative Hanson, District 100, stated that they have not been able to harvest any alfalfa seed since 1980, so this year her family put up a fence that was deer proof, in a 10' X 10' area. She said they then called up the U.S. Forest Service Range Specialist and Fish and Game Warden in their area and had them come out to measure the forage inside the enclosed area. She said that she does not know how the Fish and Game is going to deal with this deer problem, but the ranchers and farmers need help. She feels that the Fish and Game is going to

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

January 24, 1985

Page Four

have to make some better management decisions.

OPPONENTS: Jim Flynn, Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks spoke as an opponent to House Bill No. 191. He handed out a copy of his testimony. (See Exhibit No. 4)

Hal Price, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation, spoke in opposition of this bill. He handed out a copy of his testimony. (See Exhibit No. 5)

Janet Ellis, representing the Montana Audobon Council, spoke in opposition of this bill. She handed in a copy of her testimony. (See Exhibit No. 6)

There were no further proponents or opponents to this bill.

Lee Howard handed out a sheet of quotes taken from a Wildlife Survey. (See Exhibit No. 7)

DISUCSSION OF HOUSE BILL 191: Representative Ellison asked Janet Ellis that if her council is supportive of some kind of damage compensation, but not this particular bill, do they have an alternative suggestion. Ms. Ellis replied that they did not.

Representative Phillips asked Mr. Flynn what some of the other states were doing about this problem. Mr. Flynn stated that he was not familiar in detail with what other states are doing. He assumes that there is some sort of claim process that they go through.

Representative Montayne wanted to know how much per bushel the alfalfa growers were losing. Representative Asay said that they were losing approximately \$1.00 to \$1.25 per pound. Representative Montayne stated that when he was going through the bill, he didn't notice any suggestion for harvesting such as the dates, seasons, etc., and he thought that these would be important. Representative Asay replied that there is a large variety of crops being damaged, and the harvest dates for all these crops are different.

Representative Eudaily stated that he had a couple of technical questions he would like to discuss with Representative Asay concerning Section 5, page 4. He felt

that there should be a reference in that section to a hunting charge or free public hunting. He also noted in Section 3, page 3, that when a landowner files his first claim, he goes through an entire process with the department. Representative Eudaily said that he felt Section 5 should be one of the first sections of the bill because it notes that a claimant has had his land open for hunting before he files a claim. He said that then the eligibility could be established before the entire process in Section 3 begins. Representative Asay agreed.

Representative Rapp-Svrcek prefaced his questions by stating that game damage is a severe problem in Sanders County, and the damage they receive is primarily from elk. He also noted that his area also receives a lot of money from these elk. He wanted to know why or how the cutter bees were used in producing alfalfa. Representative Asay stated that the cutter bees were used for pollination. Representative Rapp-Svrcek then asked Mr. Price if the Montana Wildlife Federation had any ideas or suggestions as to the preventive measures that the landowner might have to lessen the game damage. Mr. Price said that they did not address that specifically, but he again went over the recommendations that were stated in his written testimony. (See Exhibit No. 5) Representative Rapp-Svrcek referred to Section 1, page 3, subsection 3, lines 10-13, and asked Representative Asay that given the broad implications of this issue to landowners, didn't he think that a possibility might exist where this committee might be stacked in the landowners favor. Representative Asay replied that he had neighbors that will not allow hunters on their property. He also stated that he feels that most people would have the best interest of the wildlife, as well as, the farmer at heart. Representative Rapp-Svrcek then asked Mr. Flynn about the statement in the second paragraph of his testimony. (See Exhibit No. 4) He wanted to know if Mr. Flynn could assure the committee that the Department, when they have been asked to address these complaints, has addressed them completely. Mr. Flynn said that he would not try to attempt to say that they are addressing every case to the fullest, but he feels that they are addressing the majority of the cases. He said that addressing the cases is one thing, and solving them is another. Representative Rapp-Svrcek wanted to know by what criteria the

FISH AND GAME COMMITTEE

January 24, 1985

Page Six

Department decides to give fence or other controls to the landowner. Mr. Flynn replied that the decision is usually made between the warden and the landowner and they try to resolve the problem. Mr. Flynn also stated that they have some long term solutions that they can come up with, so they can use many different tools. Representative Rapp-Svrcek referred to Representative Jenkins' mention of the shortage of deer in the early 1970's, and wanted to know if there was some way that the Department could better manage the game control so that there is not this great fluctuation. Mr. Flynn stated that that statement gets to the heart of the whole issue before them. The Department does not have the funds available to do the necessary aerial surveys. He said that in 1983 he proposed to the Legislature a request for more money so that the Department could get a better handle on the number of wild game out there. He said he is making the same request again this session, but his response has not been very good in getting money for aerial survey.

Representative Grady wanted to know if the impact statement took into consideration all wild animals or just the wild animals hunted. Representative Asay stated that there is not enough money in the general fund to even begin to cover the damage done by all wild animals, but they are trying to get a program set up for only those species that are hunted.

Representative Moore asked Mr. Flynn if he had any idea how much his department would increase in man power and dollars spent if they were to assume this landowner compensation. Mr. Flynn said that he did not have any concrete answer to this, but a similar program in Colorado requires the use of six people on the staff. Representative Moore asked Mr. Flynn if he knew what Colorado pays the six people to implement the program. Mr. Flynn stated that on an annual basis they process approximately 200 claims and they budget \$650,000.00. This past year they paid out that plus another \$150,000.00. Representative Moore asked Mr. Flynn if he thought it would ever be possible to allow spotlighting. Mr. Flynn replied that this is the only body that can make spotlighting possible.

Representative Cobb wanted to know where the money would come from to support such a program. Mr. Flynn replied that according to the fiscal note, it is the assumption that these animals are the property of the State of Montana and therefore, their responsibility.

Representative Jenkins asked Mr. Howard if he felt their problem with overpopulation of deer began when the buck only season started. Mr. Howard stated that it seemed to be the time when the problem began in their area. It started in about 1976 and has continued on to the present day. Representative Jenkins wanted to know if Mr. Howard noticed any effect of the last week doe season when it first opened up. Mr. Howard stated that he felt it was totally worthless and very few people had any success. Representative Jenkins asked Mr. Howard how many times the department had called people in his area in the last four or five years. Mr. Howard said that they had had contact with two different biologists in the last six years, but they have never found a solution to the overpopulation problem.

Representative Cobb wanted to know if changing Section 1, subsection 2, page 2, line 19, from 48 hours to 96 hours would make any difference and get some results. Mr. Flynn said that he would not think a time period change would have any effect on the fiscal note.

Representative Jenkins asked Mr. Flynn if he had any figures on what it cost to use the different tactics in solving the deer problem. Mr. Flynn stated that last year they spent approximately \$150,000.00 using the different tools available to them trying to address the game damage problem. Representative Jenkins wanted to know what percentage of the tools work. Mr. Flynn replied that he did not know what percentage works, but they try to apply the right one to work in the right place.

Representative Grady wanted to know if the Legislature had ever addressed this problem before by setting up an interim committee or proposing anything on this. Mr. Flynn said that after the 1981 legislative session, an interim legislative committee set up a general core to study the Fish and Game Department and its relationship with the public, but they did not get specifically into every area. Mr. Flynn stated that as far as game damage is concerned, they are attempting to get more money to purchase flying time on an annual basis, and to address the problems in our state.

Representative Ellison shared with the committee, an experience that had taken place here in our state in

controlling an elk herd. He said that there was an aerial survey done of an area where they were able to count the number of elk and then determine the optimal number for that area. Then they were going to kill the elk down to that optimal amount. Representative Ellison felt that this was a logical solution, and it might work better than some other solutions if it is implemented in other areas. Mr. Flynn stated that this is what they were trying to do, but they don't have the money to fly around to all the different areas.

There being no further questions from the committee, Chairman Ream asked Representative Asay to close. In closing, Representative Asay stated that if you don't like the situation that this bill has brought to you, it is not the bill that is the problem, it is the situation out there. He said that the Department of Fish, Wildlife, and Parks is receiving a handsome revenue from the license fees and they do not have to share this revenue with anyone. He said that this whole issue is the simple matter that people are getting hit hard by this deer overpopulation, and it is not an accidental development. The deer were imported into eastern Montana in the years 1943-1950 to increase the herds, and now we are suffering from severe overpopulation and we seem to be able to do nothing about it. We have to recognize that we are facing a very difficult problem, and we must find a solution.

ADJOURNMENT: There being no further business before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 5:10 p.m.



---

BOB REAM, Chairman



Exhibit #1  
1-24-85  
H.B. #191

Dick & Joan De Cock.  
Fosyth Mont 59327  
100 acm of Alfalfa Seed -  
8 8000<sup>00</sup> less than from 1983

Crop -  
1984 crop - better crop -  
Had been sprayed, +  
a large investment in  
Leaf Cutter bees. 1983 crop  
did not have investment -

was excessive + not  
acceptable.

actual count of  
hunters + hunting success  
was tabulated again at  
the request of local fish +  
wildlife through the  
hunting season -

Local fish + Game personnel  
requested an actual count  
of deer population for one  
week -

150 hunting parties -  
only 70 Deer harvested.

Results were an average  
of 140 deer per site.

Kill permit was issued  
6 deer were killed - the  
damage to the crop caused  
by removal of killed deer

Deer damage study

done under license

Wanda Surpin Vision in

Powder River Co. 7-15-85 9:15 a

1984 - an area of alfalfa  
was fenced with stock  
panels + fencing to prevent  
any entry by livestock  
or wildlife.  
A single fenced area yielded 2.92 ac  
of alfalfa per acre  
of alfalfa per acre  
Tons eaten by deer 1.27 per ac.  
1.15 per ac



502 South 19th

Exhibit #2  
1-24-85  
H.B. #191

Bozeman, Montana 59715

Phone (406) 587-3153

TESTIMONY BY: Lorna Frank

BILL # HB 191 DATE Jan. 24, 1985

SUPPORT X OPPOSE \_\_\_\_\_

Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee and Rep. Asay .

I am Lorna Frank, representing Montana Farm Bureau Federation.

Montana Farm Bureau supports HB 191, our members feel farmers and ranchers who incur damages to crops from big game animals should be compensated by the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Parks provided the farmer or rancher allows reasonable hunting on his land.

Lorna Frank  
SIGNED

WITNESS STATEMENT

Name Carol Mosher Committee On Fish & Game  
Address Augusta, Mt. Date 1-24-85  
Representing Montana Cow Belles Support X  
Bill No. H.B. 191 Oppose \_\_\_\_\_  
Amend \_\_\_\_\_

AFTER TESTIFYING, PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.

Comments:

1. We recognize the possibility for damages from game and the timely need for responding.
2. We recognize the possible limitations of the Fish, Wildlife and Parks at certain times when there are numerous complaints.
3. We are not sure of the fiscal <sup>implications</sup> ~~impact~~ which could occur.
4. We do speak in support of the basic theory of H B 191

Itemize the main argument or points of your testimony. This will assist the committee secretary with her minutes.

HB 191

Testimony presented by Jim Flynn, Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks

January 24, 1985

The issue of game damage is not new to Montana law. Two Supreme Court decisions have previously addressed the issue of game damage to crops. In the State vs. Rathbone, the Supreme Court's decision states: "Montana is one of the few areas in the nation where wild game abounds. It is regarded as one of the greatest of the state's natural resources, as well as the chief attraction for visitors. Wild game existed here long before the coming of man. One who acquires property in Montana does so with notice and knowledge of the presence of wild game and presumably is cognizant of its natural habits. Wild game does not possess the power to distinguish between Fructus naturales and Fructus industriales, and cannot like domestic animals be controlled through an owner. Accordingly, a property owner in this state must recognize the fact that there may be some injury to property or inconvenience from wild game for which there is no recourse."

Similarly, in another court decision, that being Sackman vs. State Fish and Game, it is noted that the department is required to investigate complaints of wild animals damaging property and to address that complaint accordingly. That finding is embodied in Section 87-1-225, MCA, which is the section of law before you today.

I mention these relevant court actions because in the department's performance of its statutory responsibilities to manage the game animals for the State of Montana those court actions provide guidance for our actions.

In managing the game numbers for the state, hunting is the primary tool used to achieve an acceptable balance between the habitat available and the number of animals occupying that habitat. It is important that the balance be an acceptable level for all the people of Montana, including the land holder and the hunter.

During the past two years, in an attempt to reach an acceptable balance, general hunting seasons were substantially liberalized.

In 1984, hunters could each take up to six deer in many areas, and 103,375 deer "B" tags were issued - more than three times as many as in 1983 and five times the 1982 total.

The next best alternative is the special hunting season; these are used frequently and are effective.

In the past 18 months, approximately 100 early and late season special hunts have been conducted.

During this same time period, we have responded to problem areas by supplying more than 1800 elk panels, 1550 rolls of snowfence, 650 rolls of field wire, 114 gallons of deer repellent and 45 tons of bloodmeal to landowners. In addition, we have provided herders, scareguns and have trapped and transplanted animals.

As a last resort are kill permits, and in the last 18 months 162 have been issued throughout the state authorizing the taking of 2,263 deer, antelope and elk.

As indicated, our primary focus is to manage the numbers through the use of seasons and bag limits with an acceptance of the responsibility to use all other means at our disposal to prevent the damage in those areas where hunting has not addressed the need. But I would emphasize that the foundation of the program is the harvesting of animals.

A primary concern we have with HB 191 is its treatment of hunting. The bill would appear to acknowledge that hunting should occur, but does not indicate how or to what extent hunting should occur. This vagary raises a series of questions.

Is hunting to mean 2 people for 2 days during a season?

Is hunting to mean a specific number of individuals for a specific number of days during the season?

Is hunting to mean hunting every year or does the bill's reference only apply to hunting during the season of game damage?

Would a land holder who leased the rights for restrictive, private hunting be eligible for the same consideration as one who allows unlimited public access?

When one land holder doesn't allow hunting and creates a refuge from which animals forage onto another's property, has the hunting criteria been satisfied?

And finally, who will evaluate the affidavit that hunting has occurred?

These questions immediately come to mind and their answers must be considered in deliberations on this bill.

Of additional concern is the vagueness surrounding the use of the word "damage."

Criteria will be necessary to determine when a claim may be filed and how it should be considered, when "damage" begins and ends or when "further damage" begins.

The same questions could be applied to the determination of whether actions taken were deficient or not.

Who is to make these determinations and what are to be their credentials?

It would seem that HB 191 has set up a series of processes which have the real potential for a whole series of contentious actions.

The concern which stimulated HB 191 is a concern we share. Game damage should be avoided to the greatest extent possible. This avoidance should be achieved through hunter harvest and this agency in particular using all tools at its disposal to combat specific situations.

HB 191 would propose to dramatically change a process that has been ongoing for many years. Because of this proposed change, it should be considered very carefully.

We submit that the change itself is not in order and HB 191 would not adequately implement that change if it were in order.

We urge that the bill do not pass.

Exhibit #5  
1-24-85  
H.B. #191

MONTANA WILDLIFE FEDERATION

TESTIMONY ON HB 191

1/24/85

Mr. Chairman, members of the committee, my name is Hal Price, representing the Montana Wildlife Federation. The Montana Wildlife Federation is an organization of approximately 4,500 sportsmen who are members of 17 affiliated clubs throughout the state.

We realize that many landowners have crops and property damaged by wildlife. And we know and appreciate that valuable wildlife habitat is provided on private land throughout the state. But nevertheless, we are opposed to HB 191. Not because we feel there is no damage problem, but rather because we feel monetary compensation is the wrong solution.

Here are some problems we see with a compensation program:

---it could reduce the incentive for property owners to implement preventive measures;

---it would require considerable administrative overhead. For example, in 1982 Colorado's game damage program required 6 full time and 10 part time employees to administer a program of nearly one million dollars;

---it would, most likely, be like other government payment programs. They seem to get bigger and more popular and thus even more popular and even bigger.

The Montana Wildlife Federation is strongly supportive of the Department of Fish, Wildlife and Park's program to reduce game damage through use of various fencing, repellent and "scare" techniques. And we would encourage the legislature to give favorable

Exhibit #5  
p. 2  
1-24-1985

Page 2 (HB 191, MWF)

consideration to the department's funding request for its game damage program. We would also point out that there is a direct relationship between the ability to manage big game in general and game damage to crops. The department could, in our opinion, do a better job of management if it had better data on game numbers and population characteristics.

HB 191 obviously seeks a quick response to landowners' requests for help. We understand the problem when there are 50 deer in your seed alfalfa and the need to act fast. The Montana Wildlife Federation would support any reasonable program which the department could design to enable it to act faster and more efficiently, up to and including a highly mobile team approach using personnel specially trained to deal with severe, localized problems. The point is, we urge the legislature and the department to feel confident that they have "tried it all" before getting into a payment program.

Thank you for the opportunity to speak.

Montana Audubon Council  
Testimony HB 191  
January 24, 1985

Exhibit #6  
1-24-85  
H.B. #191

Mr. Chairman and Members of the Committee,

My name is Janet Ellis and I'm here today representing the Montana Audubon Council. The Council is composed of 7 Chapters of the National Audubon Society and represents over 2000 members.

The Council supports the intentions of HB 191. Especially when winters are long and hard, game animals do what they have to do to survive: they seek food. Landowners can run into significant financial problems if these animals arrive in large numbers to eat hay and other crops. It seems appropriate for the state of Montana to reimburse landowners for damage done by the state's wildlife.

Whereas the Audubon Council supports the intentions of HB 191, we cannot support this legislation as written. The program that HB 191 sets up, without stricter guidelines, could easily become an administrative and financial disaster and unduly tax Montana's citizens. 1985 is a difficult time for many Montanans financially. This program leaves too many questions unanswered regarding, specifically, who qualifies for damage and when, what is a reasonable damage claim amount and how is that amount to be assessed, and what qualifies as wildlife damage. More research needs to be done on this program to answer these questions, as well as to learn how positive management policies can prevent crop damage by wildlife.

I also wish to speak about one other aspect of HB 191 that I hope you will consider carefully: the funding of this program. The Audubon Council believes that wildlife is a public trust resource. We believe that every Montanan has the responsibility of keeping this resource viable. While sportsmen do enjoy Montana's wildlife actively, we do not believe that the entire "game compensation program" should be funded by this isolated group of wildlife "users." Ranchers, usually, enjoy game animals at least as much as sportmen do. City dwellers can watch deer graze for hours. The tourist industry in the state largely depends on game animals being visible. The point is, that wildlife is a public trust resource so the entire public should support the game compensation program: most, if not all, of this program should be funded out of General Fund monies and not sportsmen's conservation licenses.

In conclusion, at this time, the Montana Audubon Council

Montana Audubon Council  
Testimony HB 191  
January 24, 1985

page 2

urges a do not pass for HB 191. We do, however, hope that you will study this program carefully and make recommendations at a future date to help resolve landowner compensation problems.

Thank you.

Exhibit #7  
1-24-85  
H.B. #191

MANAGEMENT OF THE POPULATION  
STATEWIDE WILDLIFE SURVEY & INVENTORY

- 75-76 Fawn survival figures for 1975 indicate an upturn in survival after 3 years of steady decline.
- 76-77 Post season mule deer production suggested that the mule deer population may be increasing regionwide.
- 77-78 Mule deer numbers seem to be increasing regionwide.
- 78-79 The growing mule deer population will eventually require increased harvest, particularly harvest of does.
- 79-80 As the mule deer population increases, we must initiate management to reduce this increase.

During these 5 years the Department of Fish, Wildlife & Parks maintained a buck only season with the exception of one week of doe hunting in a limited number of areas.

VISITORS' REGISTER

FISH AND GAME

COMMITTEE

BILL NO. 191

DATE 1-24-1985

SPONSOR ASAY

NAME (please print)	RESIDENCE	SUPPORT	OPPOSE
Janet Ellis	MT Audubon Council		X
Robert VanDerVere	Self	X	
Lorna Frank	Bozeman	X	
Mary Mear	Malta	X	
J. Asay	Dist 27	X	
Stuart Duggott	mt. Stockgrowers mt. Ass of Grazing Districts		
Hal Price	Mont Wildlife Federation		X
Scott Ross	Walleyes Unlimited		
Keith G. Seaburg	milas City		
Dan L. Oakland	Great Falls, MT		
Cent Hamblin	Forsyth MT	X	
Dave Hage	Forsyth, MT	X	
Charles May	Lyston MI	X	
Jim Howard	Rockham Md.	X	
Mark Kline	Zugass Co	X	
Dave Blaine	Fairfield	X	
John Patton	HP97 YELLOWSTONE CO	X	
Bob Eulert	MT Stockgrowers Assn	X	

IF YOU CARE TO WRITE COMMENTS, ASK SECRETARY FOR WITNESS STATEMENT FORM.

PLEASE LEAVE PREPARED STATEMENT WITH SECRETARY.